

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-6, 10-11, and 15-30 are pending in this application. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 15-17, 23-24, and 30 are rejected as anticipated by Butchko. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection because Butchko does not disclose a system for monitoring all types of electrical component where the functioning can be checked by an operator as required by the current invention. Specifically, Applicants' specification at paragraph 22 discloses that electrical components are intended to include all types of electrical component where the functioning can be checked by an operator. Butchko is limited to checking trailer lights.

Independent claims 23 and 30 are entitled to the broadest reasonable meaning consistent with the specification. The term "electrical components" in both claims is entitled to an interpretation in line with paragraph 22, which requires more than testing trailer lights.

In addition, the doctrine of claim differentiation requires that the term electrical components in claims 23 and 30 mean something other than light bulbs. With respect to claim 23, dependant claim 29 recites that electrical components are light bulbs, therefore the same term in claim 23 cannot have the same meaning. Similarly, with respect to claim 30, dependant claim 16 recites that electrical components mean part of all of the electrical components of the vehicle and therefore claim 30 cannot take this meaning either. Therefore claim 23 and claim 30 recite a further limitation beyond light bulbs.

Since claim 23 and claim 30 require more than the testing of trailer light bulbs, and Butchko does not teach or suggest monitoring components other than light bulbs, Applicants submit that claims 23 and 30 and the claims dependant thereon are patentable and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 5, 7, 10-11, 18-20, and 25-29 are rejected as being unpatentable over Butchko in view of Summons. Claims 6, 21, and 22 are rejected as being unpatentable over Butchko in view of Summons and further in view of JP02-142093.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection because each of the rejected claims is dependant on a claim which Applicants believe patentable for the reasons stated above in regard to the 102(b) rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and send notice of allowance in the next Office communication.

\* \* \* \* \*

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.129.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP  
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 571-3400  
(713) 456-2836 (fax)  
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Tracy Druce", written in a cursive style.

Tracy W. Druce, Esq.  
Reg. No. 35,493